Iranian EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding Written Corrective Feedback with a Focus on Teaching Experience

Farhad Golpour¹
Touran Ahour*²
Saeideh Ahangari³

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to find the Iranian less and more experienced EFL teachers' beliefs in marking students' errors in writing, their preferred types of written corrective feedback, the most useful kind of teachers' written error correction feedback, and the differences between what they believe and what they actually do in giving feedback. The study was done by the cooperation of 120 available university teachers (53 less

¹ PhD Candidate in TEFL, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran;
golpourf@gmail.com
² Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran, (Corresponding Author); ahour@iaut.ac.ir; touranahour@yahoo.com
³ Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
ahangari@iaut.ac.ir

experienced and 67 more experienced) teaching writing to EFL learners at different universities in Iran. A written feedback questionnaire was employed in this descriptive survey in which both quantitative (closed-ended questions and paper investigation) and qualitative (open-ended questions) ways of data collection were used. Descriptive statistics including frequency and percentage were estimated in the quantitative data analysis. The results revealed that in error marking and in finding the most useful kind of error correction, less and more experienced teachers had different preferences; and for pointing out the errors, they also had different ideas. The reviewing of the open-ended questions for the qualitative data showed no belief discrepancies in teachers' responses to the closed-ended items and open-ended questions of the questionnaire. However, the investigation of teachers' error correction on learners' actual papers indicated that both groups' beliefs were different from their actual paper correction. The implications of the study are for teachers, policymakers, and decision-makers in educational settings.

Keywords: Belief, Written Corrective Feedback, Experience, Practice, Teachers

Introduction

In all educational systems, some factors such as educational content, teachers and students are very important. Before 1980s, the focus of education was on reforming educational content and the content was evaluated by investigating the amount students learned. The role of teachers in learning opportunities was totally ignored (Bauersfeld, 1979). Teachers' beliefs influence their consciousness, teaching attitude, teaching methods and teaching policy. Teachers' beliefs also strongly influence their teaching behavior and, learner development, i.e. their beliefs guide their decision-making, behavior, and interactions with students and, in turn, create an objective reality in the classroom, the things that students experience as real and true. (Heather & Andrzejewski, 2009). It was argued that teachers' beliefs have an essential role in their own teaching and their beliefs influence their teaching (Grossman et al., 1989). Later, it is also mentioned that teachers are active decision-makers and that by integrating thought, knowledge and beliefs, which are context-based, practice-oriented and personalized, can make educational decisions (Borg, 2003). Erkmen (2014) states that it is difficult for teachers to change their personal beliefs since they are implicit. However, it has been suggested that beliefs can be transformed through pedagogical practice and subsequent reflection about one's own professional experience (Blázquez & Tagle, 2010).

In this case, Skott (2009) declared that teachers' beliefs are considered as an explicatory principle for practice. Based on this view, in teaching writing, which is the concern of this study, teachers' beliefs regarding how to improve learners' writing performance through different ways of giving feedback requires investigation and that whether their beliefs are reflected in their actual practices when correcting their students' writings.

During the period of teaching English as a second language, different views have been presented about teaching various skills and the ways of treating the errors and error correction. For instance, in Audio-lingual Method from 1970s to 1980s, learners were asked to produce language accurately and errors had to be avoided totally. In the 1970s, process-oriented writing model was common and one important way to improve learners' writing was teachers' comments on students' writings, that is, the corrective feedback that teachers provided for learners. Still, many teachers and students believe that feedback is very helpful in improving learners' writing. Studies conducted by Banan's (2003), Mike (2008), and Shelley and Jill (2010) indicated that giving corrective feedback can improve learners' writing accuracy.

Moreover, some studies done in Iran approve the influence of corrective feedback on writing such as Rahimi (2009), Azizian and Rouhi (2015) and Talatifard (2016). In contrast, Fazio (2001), Truscott (2004), and some other studies done in Iran such as Pakbaz (2014) found that after giving feedback there was no significant improvement in students' writings. This shows that there is no agreement on the effective role of written corrective feedback. This may refer to different views or beliefs among teachers regarding the kind of corrective feedback and also the kind of feedback they actually give to the learners' writings. In addition, some studies investigated the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actual practice in giving feedback to learners' errors. In Some studies, such as Lee's (2003, 2004, 2009) and Rafiei and Salehi's (2016), mismatches were found between teachers' beliefs and actual practice in giving feedback and some studies such as Akbari et al.'s (2008) found adjustment between teachers' beliefs and actual practice. It is also believed that experience of teachers can affect their beliefs and preferences in choosing the type of feedback they provide to the learners' errors (Brown, 2012, 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Norouzian, 2015; Yero, 2002).

To the knowledge of the researchers, and based on their experiences and consultation with writing teachers in the EFL context of Iran, many teachers suppose that giving feedback and paper correction take their time and if they give feedback, it is not clear whether it will be effective in improving leaners' writing or not, or whether learners will read their comments or not. Some teachers express that when they correct learners' writings, they correct structural and mechanical errors and ignore other kinds of errors while some teachers claim that they pay more attention to the major errors or the ones that threaten communication and not just the grammatical ones. However, many teachers just correct structural errors and do not consider those that may hinder the communication of meaning. The consequence is that our students cannot convey their messages through writing. Their focus is on meeting the teachers' expectations and producing a correct paper regarding the structure (Birjandi & Malmir, 2009). To overcome these kinds of problems, there is a strong need to know the beliefs of writing teachers about useful ways of improving the students' writing performances and to find the ways to adjust their beliefs with their actions and practices in real classrooms. Therefore, this study aimed to find out the Iranian less and more experienced EFL university teach-

ers' beliefs in marking students' errors in writing, their preferred types of written corrective feedback, the most useful kind of written error correction feedback, and the differences between what they believe and what they actually do in giving feedback to their students' writings. This kind of study has not been, yet, conducted in the university setting of Iran. In this regard, knowing the kinds of teachers' feedback and their beliefs in marking students' errors would help the other teachers to decide on the type of feedback and error correction that best suits their own students.

Literature Review
Teachers' Beliefs

Belief construct has different definitions in different educational contexts. Yero (2002) called belief as generalizations about things, it means the ideas and evaluations that we make about ourselves, world around us and others and it is external reality of internal representation. Richardson (2003) defined belief as "psychologically held understandings, premises or propositions about the world that are felt to be true" (p. 2). Borg (2001) presented the definition of the teachers' belief as "a term usually used to refer to teacher's pedagogical beliefs, or those beliefs of relevance to an individual teaching" (p. 187). Beliefs are judgments and evaluations that we make about ourselves, others, and the world around us. They are personal ideas based on observation or rational thinking (Khader, 2012). Some researchers (Bruning et al., 1999; Yero, 2002) proposed that beliefs are unconscious and they are some implicit ideas about the world, therefore, people's behaviors are conducted by their beliefs automatically. Even beliefs can influence an individual's perception and focus. According to Pourhosein Gilakjani (2012), a belief is any premise that starts with the term "I believe that." Beliefs that are related to other beliefs are regarded as "core" or "central beliefs." If a belief is associated with other beliefs, it will have more outcomes to them. According to Poulson et al. (2001), the selection of teaching methods is under the influence of teachers' belief system. Whereas teachers' beliefs cannot be observed, it should be inferred from their action, intention and speech. Even in the form of educational decision, some evidence of belief can be found. However, Fang (1996) discovered that in some studies the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actions is negative and it can be attributed to the social issues and classroom life.

Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback was defined differently by different scholars. Hattie and Timperley (2007) stated that "feedback is conceptualized as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding" (p. 85). Ellis (2009) stated that the theoretical support for corrective feedback is taken from the claim that second language learning needs both positive and negative evidence. It means that we must tell learners what is not correct and tell them what is correct. According

to Ellis (2009), there are six kinds of corrective feedback including direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, and metalinguistic corrective feedback, focused versus unfocused corrective feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation.

In this regard, written corrective feedback refers to teachers' reflection on learners' papers. Brown (2003) stated that from the 1970s to 1980s the prominent theory was the behaviorists' one. Based on this theory, if the error was not corrected immediately, it would lead to fossilization. In contrast, within the next decades, process-writing gained great deal of attention, and focus was placed on the writing process rather than the final product of learners. This is why; giving feedback of various kinds to improve learners' writing performance gained much importance in the writing classes. In terms of learnability discussion, the comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) is not enough for language acquisition. For this reason, some scholars such as White (1989) believe that if second language learners want to gain native-like proficiency, negative evidence or what is ungrammatical is required for effectiveness of corrective feedback in language learning.

According to Long (1996), when learners make hypothesis based on their native language structures, positive evidence is not sufficient, negative evidence is also necessary. Since negative evidence is provided for learners' erroneous production, it can be in the form of corrective feedback that occurs in the classroom interactions. Error correction in writing has encountered great changes over the recent years. Based on the findings of Ellis (2009) and Bitchener (2008), explicit corrective feedback provides learners with direct information as to what has gone wrong, especially if learners are not proficient enough to find the solution for their errors. Explicit CF has also proved to enhance acquisition of certain grammatical structures (Sheen, 2007). Sheen et al. (2009) support direct and indirect CF and their contributions to writing development by stating that "…corrective feedback may enhance learning by helping learners to (1) notice their errors in their written work, (2) engage in hypotheses testing in a systematic way and (3) monitor the accuracy of their writing by tapping into their existing explicit grammatical knowledge" (p. 567).

Empirical Studies

One of the most common forms of teachers' responses to students' composition is error correction. Lee (2004) found that learners consider error correction essential and urgent for quality of their writing. Ferris (2002) believed that since learners are in the process of learning and acquiring the syntactic and morphological system and lexicons, giving feedback helps them to overcome their deficits and learn some strategies for correcting and avoiding errors. However, Ferris (2002) intensifies that the focus of error correction should be "on patterns of error, Ferris's suggestion about selecting error correction based on patterns has been considered by many researchers as an appropriate way to decrease the negative results of error correction (Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris, 2002; Sheen et al., 2008).

However, some studies are against error correction, for example, Truscott (1996) proposed that teachers should not correct learners' grammatical mistakes in second language writing classes. Because he believed that paying attention to grammar not only is not helpful but it also wastes the time and energy of learners and diverts their attention from the useful aspects of writing instruction. Truscott (2004) also stated that error correction encourages students to write shorter essays because they do not like to commit too many mistakes that lead to avoidance behavior in learners. Ferris (1995) suggested that by focusing on content and the way of writing, accurate use of language gradually emerges like what happens in first language acquisition.

There are also some studies on the effect of written corrective feedback. For example, Ferris (2003) indicated that indirect error correction such as highlighting can improve learners' writing better than direct one, however, in some cases direct correction is more beneficial than indirect one, for instance, when teaching beginning-level learners, when errors are permanent and when drawing learners' attention to some errors is necessary. Gobert (2010) in an action research discovered that in correcting grammatical errors, learners like their errors to be corrected regarding content and organization. Moreover, he found that self-correcting and peer-review can be helpful for learners' writing development.

In a study conducted by Rahimi (2009) about the effects of feedback on accurate writing of Iranian English major students, by selecting two groups, the results indicated that both groups' writing accuracy got better but feedback group's progress was more than that of other one. Azizian and Rouhi (2015) examined the effect of peer corrective feedback on feedback givers and receivers in L2 writing with 45 learners of English in three writing classes which served as the feedback givers, receivers, and the control group. The results imply that learners' involvement in peer writing correction can result in significant L2 writing accuracy.

The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on intermediate EFL learners' narrative writing were investigated by Talatifard (2016) in Iran. The result of the study indicated that participants in indirect corrective feedback significantly outperformed those in control and direct groups in narrative writing. However, some studies such as Pakbaz (2014) who investigated the effect of giving explicit or implicit written corrective feedback on L2 learners' ability to write in English in the EFL context of Iran found no significant differences between giving feedback and writing. The results of the study revealed no statistically significant differences between the implicit and explicit group on their correct use of the specified structures.

In this regard, Khanlarzadeh and Nemati (2016) aimed to find out the effect of direct unfocused written corrective feedback (WCF) on the grammatical accuracy of elementary students in the EFL context of Iran. To this end, the researchers selected two intact classes and assigned them to a direct feedback group and a control group. Within the three months of the study, the students produced eight pieces of writing through a pretest, three writing tasks along

with their revisions, and a posttest. Then, the grammatical accuracy of their writings was checked. The results revealed the outperformance of the experimental group in the revision of the three writing tasks. However, there was no significant difference in their posttest after a one month of interval when they produced a new piece of writing. The researchers conclude that although unfocused WCF improved their writing accuracy during the revision process, the improvement was not noticed in their posttest, implying that the effect was not extended to the EFL learners' future writing when there was no feedback. Unlike Khanlarzadeh and Nemati (2016), Taheri and Mashhadi Heidar (2019) explored the effect of focused written corrective feedback on the paragraph writing ability of 60 undergraduate university students who were high/low self-regulated learners. The students were assigned into the experimental group (which were then assigned into the high and low self-regulated groups through a self-regulated learning scale) and control group. In the control group, the learners received conventional types of feedback, while, those in the experimental group received focused WCF in some areas of grammar. The results revealed a significant improvement in the writing ability of the experimental group that received WCF. It was also found that WCF was more beneficial for the high self-regulated learners.

Some scholars have conducted studies on teachers' beliefs and their real practice in giving feedback. In his study on corrective feedback, Ellis (2009) demonstrated some conflicts between teachers' beliefs and their real practice in terms of feedback provision. Moreover, studies done on secondary school teachers in Hong Kong by Lee (2003, 2004, 2009) revealed that there are some mismatches between beliefs and practices in terms of paying attention to linguistic forms, utilizing complete or selective error correction and providing of error codes on learners' text. Lee's findings show that teachers' beliefs and practice are not consistent due to lots of influential factors.

Rafiei and Salehi (2016) also studied the written feedback practices as well as the TOEFL/IELTS Iranian writing teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards written feedback and the actual feedback in their writing classes. The analyses revealed that although most of them believe that teachers must give feedback to the language, organization and content of students' essays, but most of the written feedback was given to the language.

In a study, Khanlarzadeh and Taheri (2017) surveyed L2 writing teachers' perception about different aspects of written corrective feedback (WCF) and their problems while they put their perceptions into practice. They randomly selected 47 TEFL-degree holders and 39 non-TEFL-degree holders from Tehran ELT institutes and asked them to fill out a questionnaire to elicit their perceptions of different aspects of written error correction. In addition, as a follow up, they interviewed 10 of the teachers in each group. The results revealed that degree-holder teachers preferred more selective and indirect kinds of WCF and inclined to use different types of error correction techniques. Both groups complained about the time constrains that affected the type and amount of their given feedback. It was also found that a majority of teachers when giving WCF did not use a marking code because it is baffling to the language learners.

As the literature shows there have been some inconsistencies between teachers' actual practices and their beliefs. Although in the previous studies differences between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices were found, Katia (2011) conducted a cross-sectional study by using mixed methods in Brazil which showed that Brazilian teachers believe in form-focused correction as an instructional approach and in their classes they did this model of the correction. Moreover, Akbari et al. (2008) studied Iranian English teachers' beliefs about teaching writing. The beliefs of teachers and the reflection of these beliefs on writing were examined. The results of the study revealed no discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their actual practice in giving written corrective feedback.

Some studies show the effects of teachers' experiences on the error correction and corrective feedback and teachers' beliefs (Brown, 2012, 2014; Ferris et al., 2011; Lee, 2011). These studies found that teaching experience can influence the way of error correction, such as amount and manner of feedback provisions by teachers. Norouzian (2015) analyzed the data gathered from 15 Iranian teachers teaching writing course to find the impact of teaching experience on the teachers' perception towards type (indirect and direct) and amount (selective and comprehensive) of their written corrective feedback. The findings showed that teaching experience has a significant effect on direct manner of feedback provision by highly experienced teachers. Moreover, the qualitative findings revealed that highly experienced teachers provide more precise correction in comparison to less experienced ones.

As the literature showed, there were controversies in the results of studies related to the teachers' beliefs and their actual practices. There are few studies conducted in this area in the EFL context of Iran and almost no study on corrective feedback was carried out among the university teachers. For this reason, in order to fill the gap and contribute more to the field of writing, this study aimed to find out the more and less experienced EFL university teachers' beliefs in marking students' writing errors, type of corrective feedback and its matches and mismatches with their actual practice. In this regard, the following specific questions were posed:

1. What are the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs in marking (e.g., mark all errors, mark major errors, etc.) students' errors in writing?
2. What is the most useful type of error correction feedback (e.g., clues or direction on how to fix, error identification, correction with comments, error correction by the teacher, commentary, no feedback on an error, personal comments on the content) based on the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs?
3. What kind of error (organization, content or ideas, punctuation, spelling, and vocabulary) is more useful to point out in students' writings based on the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs?
4. What kind of corrective feedback do teachers actually give to their students' writings?

Methodology
Participants

The study was done by the cooperation of accessible teachers teaching writing to EFL learners at different universities in Iran such as Tabriz, Gilan, Shiraz, Ahvaz, Isfahan and Tehran universities and some Islamic Azad university branches including Rasht, Tabriz, Lahijan and Zanjan. Teachers were selected based on convenience sampling (Best & Kahn, 2006). They were male and female teachers with different academic degrees (MA and PhD) and various years of teaching experiences. In this study, teachers with less than five years, as indicated by Rivkin et al. (2005), Rice (2010), and Fernandez-Garcia et al. (2019), were considered as less experienced ones and those with five and above were considered as experienced ones. In this regard, 120 available university teachers (53 less experienced and 67 more experienced) participated in the study.

Instruments and Materials
Instruments

By means of a written feedback questionnaire (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010), teachers' opinions about correcting different kinds of errors were found. Amrhein and Nassaji validated the items of the questionnaire in a pilot study (in Canada) with six English teachers and made the necessary modification to satisfy its content validity. In addition, they indicated that the items of the questionnaire had been taken from the previous studies for the similar research questions (e.g., Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994), which adds to its validity. We also searched for more validation indicators in more recent studies and found the implementation of similar questionnaire items in the study of Chen et al. (2016) in China and Moslemi and Dastgoshadeh (2017) in Iran. In spite of this, we also submitted the questionnaire to four experienced English teachers in different universities to check for the clarity of the items and they considered them as clear and comprehensible. In this regard, we used the questionnaire as a validated one in this study.

Regarding its reliability, Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) did not estimated its reliability for the reason that "the items were a combination of closed- and open-ended items that did not comprise a scale" and also "there is no standard way for calculating the reliability of such questionnaire items" (p. 118). They considered this point as a limitation of their study. However, in our study, we estimated the reliability of 18 close-ended items (part one = 6 items; part two = 7 items; and part three = 5 items) of the questionnaire through Cronbach's Alpha and the reliability of about .84 was obtained for the average reliability values of part one (α = .83), part two (α = .81), and part three (α = .87) of the questionnaire, which shows a high internal consistency.

As it was mentioned, the written feedback questionnaire consists of three parts (see Appendix). In **part one**, participant teachers were asked if they encounter many errors in their students' writings, how they would correct them.

They were asked to select their preferences out of the six suggested ways including (1) Mark all errors; (2) Mark major errors but not minor ones; (3) Mark most of the major errors but not necessarily all of them; (4) Mark only a few of the major errors; (5) Mark only the errors that interfere with communicating your ideas; and (6) Mark no error and responds only to the ideas and content, and indicate which one(s) they consider to be the most useful way for correcting EFL students' writings. They were also asked to give their reasons for their selection(s) in the form of open-ended questions. In **part two**, one sentence with an error was provided. For this sentence, seven ways of giving feedback (i.e., Clues or direction on how to fix an error; Error identification; Correction with the comments; Error correction; Commentary; No feedback on an error; Personal comments on the contents) by a teacher were presented. Below the sentence and the given feedback, the explanation of the feedback was also provided. The participant teachers were asked to read the sentence and the given feedbacks then select the number that best describes the usefulness of each feedback for the EFL students (i.e., 1 = not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = does not matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5 = very useful). They were also asked to give their reasons for each selection. In **part three**, there were five items asking the teachers' opinions about the usefulness of five types of errors (i.e., organization errors; content or idea errors; punctuation error; spelling errors; and vocabulary errors). They were asked to indicate how useful it is to point out each type of error in EFL students' written work and express their opinion by selecting the number 1-5 (i.e., 1 = not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = does not matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5 = very useful). They were also required to give the reasons for their choices.

Materials

Students' writings were used as the materials to investigate the type of error correction and feedback the less and more experienced teachers actually give on their errors. In this respect, out of the participant teachers, 15 more experienced and 15 less experienced ones showed their willingness to give their students' actual writings to the researchers in order to analyze them for the type of feedback and correction the teachers gave on them.

Procedure

The Amrhein and Nassaji's (2010) questionnaire was sent to 250 teachers by email, and out of these teachers, 80 ones responded and returned. To make it more convenient for respondents, the questionnaire was changed into the digital type in the net. Then it was sent to 150 other teachers and among them 70 teachers filled it out and returned. After checking, those that were not done completely were removed and finally120 questionnaires were selected for the analysis. To provide accurate data and compare teachers' beliefs on the items of the questionnaires and their actual error correction practice on learners' papers, the researchers asked the volunteer teachers to give their students' cor-

rected papers for the analysis. In this regard, only 30 teachers among them (15 less experienced and 15 more experienced), who were also accessible to the researchers, accepted to give their students' writing samples to the researchers. The papers were investigated by the researchers to find the kinds of errors corrected and the ways comments were given. Then this investigation was put into analysis to determine the pattern of feedback among the less and more experienced teachers.

Design and Data Analysis

A descriptive survey was used in this study with the variables of teachers' beliefs, teachers' actual practices, written corrective feedback, and experience. In this regard, quantitative and qualitative ways of data collection and analysis was used. In other words, triangulation method consisting of a questionnaire, paper investigation (quantitative methods), and open-ended questions (qualitative method) were utilized. The quantitative data were entered into the SPSS 20 and analyzed using descriptive statistics including frequency and percentage. The qualitative data were explained qualitatively using the responses of the teachers to the open-ended questions to verify or reject the quantitative results.

Results
First Research Question

In order to answer the first research question and find the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs in marking the students' errors in writing, the frequency and percentage of the selected items were obtained. These teachers were requested to select those type(s) of marking that they thought is/are more/the most useful to do. In this case, because the teachers were allowed to select more than one choice, the sum of the frequencies is not equal to the total number of the less and more experienced teachers as shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
Less and More Experienced Teachers' Beliefs in Marking Students' Errors in Writing

Experience		1.mark all errors	2. Mark major errors but not minor ones	3. Mark most of the major errors but not necessarily all of them.	4. Mark only a few of the major errors	5. Mark only the errors that interfere with communicating the ideas	6. Mark no error and respond only to the ideas and content	N
Less experienced	Frequency	17	19	8	5	20	1	53
	Percent	32	34	15	9.4	37	1.9	
more experienced	Frequency	11	27	8	11	16	3	67
	Percent	17	40	15	16.4	23	3.7	

As Table 1 indicates, a high percentage (37%) of the less experienced teachers believe that when students make many errors, it is better to "mark only the errors that interfere with communicating the ideas=item 5". It is while, a high percentage (40%) of the more experienced teachers believe that it is better to "mark major errors not the minor ones = item 2". For the less experienced teachers, item 2 (34%) and item 1(32%) and for the more experienced teachers, item 5 (23%) and item 1 (17%) are also considered useful ways of marking errors. The item 6 has not attracted the teachers' attention since it has the lowest frequency between both less experienced and more experienced teachers. In general, among six items, the second item, that is, marking just major errors not minor ones, has been selected by many teachers both less and more experienced ones. It shows that teachers prefer to correct major errors and ignore minor ones.

The reasons that the teachers gave for their choices verified their beliefs in marking the writing errors. For example, some of the more experienced teachers' said as follows:

> *T1: "I don't want to discourage my students. I highlight the major problems, especially during the first sessions".*

> *T2: I think major errors are debilitating communication. So, they should be corrected but the minor errors or any pitfalls which are not that much problematic and manipulating then would hinder communication and learner's involvement should be avoided.*

> *T3: I think number 2 is a more useful way, because for intermediate or advanced students it is not acceptable to make major mistakes and they must be made aware of their mistakes to do their best to eliminate them in their future writing assignments.*

In this regard, less experienced teachers indicated that errors that cause interference in communication should be corrected. Below are some of their responses:

> *T1: I think number 5 is more useful way because marking major errors calls students attention to the most problematic parts of their writing which may cause misunderstanding or misinterpretation of what is written.*

> *T2: I think number5 is more useful way, because correcting errors that interfere in communication make learners motivated and encouraged.*

> *T3: In my opinion, correcting all errors will make learners discouraged and demotivated.*

However, through observing their actual practices, it was revealed that in actual paper correction, a majority of less and more experienced teachers marked all errors, which was in contrast to what they believe according to the results of the questionnaire.

Second Research Question

In order to answer the second research question and know less or more experienced teachers' opinion on the most useful type of error correction feedback, the frequency and percentage of their responses were calculated. These teachers were requested to select those type(s) of error correction that they thought is/are more/the most useful to do. In this case, because the teachers were allowed to select more than one choice, the sum of the frequencies is not equal to the total number of the less and more experienced teachers as shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Less and More Experienced Teachers' Beliefs Regarding the Type of Error Correction in Students' Writing

		(Error Correction Feedback)						
		1.Clues or direction on how to fix an error	2.- Error identification	3.Correction with the comments	4.Error correction (teacher corrects error)	5. commentary (teacher gives feedback by making comments about error but not errors are corrected)	6. No feedback on an error	7. Personal comments on the contents
	Frequency (percent)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)
less experienced	NOT useful at all	3(5.7)	1(1.9)	2(3.8)	11(20.8)	4(7.5)	18(34)	21(39.6)
	not useful	6(11.3)	4(7.5)	23(43.4)	19(35.8)	5(9.4)	11(20.8)	5(9.4)
	does not matter	12(22.9)	11(20.8)	7(13.2)	9(17)	11(20.8)	12(22.6)	9(17)
	quite useful	17(32.1)	34(64.2)	13(24.5)	12(22.6)	26(49.1)	10(18.9)	16(30.2)
	very useful	15(28.3)	3(5.7)	8(15.1)	2 (3.8)	7(13.2)	2(3.8)	2(3.8)
	Total	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
more experienced	NOT useful at all	4(6)	4(6)	2(3)	9(16.7)	0(0)	28(41.8)	16(23.9)
	not useful	8(11.9)	8(11.9)	14(20.9)	13(19.4)	9(13.4)	14(20.9)	14(20.9)
	does not matter	8(11.9)	11(16.4)	17(25.4)	11(19.4)	8(11.9)	8(11.9)	12(17.9)
	quite useful	22(32.8)	32(47.8)	19(28.4)	20(29.9)	38(56.7)	12(17.9)	22(32.8)
	very useful	24(35.8)	11(16.4)	14(20.9)	5(7.5)	12(17.9)	5.(7.5)	3(4.5)
	Total	67	67	67	67	67	67	67

As Table 2 indicates, a high percentage (64.2%) of the less experienced teachers believe that when teachers are correcting learners' errors, the most useful type of error correction feedback is to "identify errors = item 2". It is while, a high percentage (56.7%) of the more experienced teachers believe that the most useful one is "commentary = item 5". For the less experienced teachers, item 1 (32% quite useful and 28.2% very useful) and item 5 (49%) and for the more experienced teachers, item1 (28% quite useful and 35.8% very useful), item 2 (47.2%), item 4 (29%) and item 7 (32%) are also considered useful ways of correcting errors. However, for the less experienced teachers, item 3 (43%), item 4 (35%), item 6 (34%) and item 7(39%) and for the more experienced teachers item 6 (41%) were considered as not useful.

Through investigating the open-ended questions, it was revealed that more experienced teachers' views on questionnaire corresponded to their answers to the open-ended questions. Teachers believed that it will help students to reread the sentences and correct the errors themselves, and then this noticing will help reoccurrence of the same error in the future to be prevented. For example, three more experienced teachers indicated that:

> T1: "It helps the student to think and discover the mistakes".

> T2: "This can be an awareness-raising activity".

> T3: "Since the type of error is indicated and there are only two choices, the teacher may hope that the student easily can identify and correct it. It provides the opportunity for students to check the grammatical rule and learn it appropriately".

After investigating the students' actual papers, it was revealed that more experienced teachers corrected learners' errors.

The less experienced teachers found error identification as the most useful item with the highest selection. In their open-ended questions, they mentioned that it is better the position of the errors to be determined at the beginning sessions so that the students would be more cautious about their upcoming writings. They indicated that the identification of the errors can raise the students' awareness and self-consciousness and make them autonomous learners. For instance, they mentioned that:

> T1: "This helps the learner reread the sentence, and find the best way to correct the sentence".

> T2: "Quite useful since it focuses on the specific error".

> T3: "This comment is useful since the exact mistake is pointed out and the student can now work on what type of error has been made and how it can be corrected".

After paper investigation, it was revealed that less experienced teachers, similar to the more experienced teachers, corrected learners' errors.

Third Research Question

In order to answer the third research question and discover which kind of error is considered more useful to be pointed out in students' writings by more and less experienced teachers, the frequency and percentage of the selected items were obtained. These teachers were requested to select those type(s) of error correction that they thought is/are more/the most useful to be pointed out. In this case, because the teachers were allowed to select more than one choice, the sum of the frequencies is not equal to the total number of the less and more experienced teachers as shown in Table 3.

Table 3.
Less and More Experienced Teachers' Beliefs Regarding the Type of Errors to be Pointed out in Students' Writing

		1.organization errors	2.content or idea errors	3.punctuation errors	4.spelling errors	5.vocabulary errors
	Frequency(percent)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)
less experienced	NOT useful at all	0	0	0	1(1.9)	0
	not useful	2(3.8)	3(5.2)	4(7.5)	7(13.2)	3(5.7)
	does not matter	4(7.5)	9(17)	13(24.5)	13(24.5)	4(7.5)
	quite useful	34(64)	27(50)	23(43.4)	17(32.1)	30(56.6)
	very useful	13(24.5)	14(26.4)	13(24.5)	15(28.3)	16(30.2)
	Total	53	53	53	53	53
More experienced	NOT useful at all	0	0	1(1.5)	2(3)	0(0)
	not useful	7(10.4)	3(4.5)	4(6)	6(9)	2(3)
	does not matter	6(9)	12(17.9)	10(14.9)	14(20)	10(14.9)
	quite useful	35(52)	34(50.7)	30(44.8)	34(50.7)	41(61.2)
	very useful	19(28)	18(26.9)	22(32.8)	11.(16.4)	14(20.9)
	Total	67	67	67	67	67

As Table 3 indicates, a high percentage (64 %) of the less experienced teachers believe that learners' "organizational errors = item 1" is the most useful type of error to be pointed out. For these teachers, items 2 (50%), 3 (43.4%), 4(32.1%), and 5(56.6%) are also considered useful to be pointed out. Based on their responses to the open-ended questions, less experienced teachers' ideas are close to what they have said on the questionnaire. For example:

> T1: *"the learners should be ready to look at the writing task as a task communicating ideas and also to be conscious of the errors interfering with accomplishing that task".*

> T2: "*the decisions originate from the nature of each notion and the extent to which each affects the real communication".*

It is while, a high percentage (61.2%) of the more experienced teachers believe that "vocabulary errors=item 5" is the most useful type to be pointed out. They also consider items1 (52%), 2 (50.7%), 3 (44.8%), and 4 (50.7%) as useful ways of correcting errors. Based on the responses to the open-ended ques-

tions, more experienced teachers' ideas are close to what they have said on the questionnaire. For instance:

> T1: "*you should observe all errors in both macro and micro structural levels*".

> T2: "*teaching all the features of writing correctly can be beneficial for the students*".

In actual paper correction, teachers corrected not only organization errors but also learners 'punctuation and spelling errors. Therefore, teachers believe that conveying meaning and communicating the intended meaning is very important. And those errors that interfere with communication are very important to be pointed out. However, in giving feedback to the students' actual writing, both groups had also corrected other errors, even they corrected the punctuation errors.

Fourth Research Question

In order to answer the fourth research question and find less or more experienced teachers' actual practices regarding written corrective feedback, the frequency and percentage of the selected items were obtained. These teachers' corrected papers were investigated to find type(s) of errors corrected by them. Both teachers' beliefs and their actual practice are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4.
Less and More Experienced Teachers' Actual Practice and Belief Regarding the Type of the Corrected Errors in Students' Writings

Experience		1.organization errors		2.content or idea errors		3.punctuation errors		4.spelling errors		5.vocabulary and grammar errors		N
		belief	practice	Belief	practice	belief	practice	belief	practice	belief	practice	
Less experienced	frequency	10	13	7	12	6	12	5	14	8	11	15
	Percent	66	86	46	80	40	80	33	93	53	73	
More experienced	frequency	8	11	8	13	5	10	8	13	11	14	15
	Percent	53	73	53	86	33	66	53	86	73	93	

As Table 4 indicates, a high percentage (66 %) of the less experienced teachers believe that when they are correcting errors, the "organization errors= item 1" is the most useful type of error to be corrected, however, in actual paper correction the high percentage (93%) dedicated to the spelling errors. It is while, a high percentage (73%) of the more experienced teachers believe that

"vocabulary errors=item 5" is the most useful to be corrected, which reflects the high percentage (93%) of their actual paper correction. As the table shows, compared to their beliefs, out of 15 selected teachers, 11-14 of the less experienced teachers and 10-14 of the more experienced teachers have almost used all types of correction in their actual practice. It shows that teachers' beliefs do not adjust to their actual performances on papers.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to find the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs in marking students' errors in writing; the most useful type of error correction feedback, the kind of error that is more useful to point out in students' writings, and their actual practices regarding written corrective feedback. To answer the question about the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs in marking students' errors in writing, "mark major errors but not minor ones" had the highest frequency among the high experienced teachers in comparison with less experienced teachers which "mark only the errors that interfere with communicating the ideas" had the highest frequency. It can be explained that because the major errors may cause misunderstanding of the intended message and prevent the meaning and purpose of the writer to be conveyed, it is essential to be corrected. Moreover, correcting all the errors especially minor ones may discourage learners. However, since the expression of meaning is important and minor or major errors may cause interference in communication, they should be corrected as the less experienced teachers emphasized. These findings are consistent with the findings of other researchers (e.g., Brown, 2012, 2014; Ferris et al., 2011; Lee, 2011; Norouzian, 2015), which emphasized the role of teaching experience in the manner and amount of errors. Moreover, the results revealed a correspondence between the teachers' responses to the questionnaire items and the open-ended questions, which indicated their preferences for marking major errors or those that interfere with the communication of the message, while in actual paper correction a majority of less and more experienced teachers marked all errors. This non-adjustment in beliefs and actual error correction by teachers is in line with the finding of Lee (2003, 2009). It can be explained by sociocultural and environmental factors that if they do not correct all the errors, they may be criticized by parents, learners and their masters.

The purpose of the second question was to find the most useful type of error correction feedback based on less and more experienced teachers' beliefs. It was found that more and less experienced teachers had different beliefs in this regard. More experienced teachers preferred "commentary", whereas, less experienced teachers opted for "error identification". It can be explained that the less experienced teachers' focus is on identification of the error to let the learners themselves correct their own errors, which would help them to think about the errors they have made and try not to repeat them in their next writings. On the other hand, more experienced teachers indicated that giving comments on the errors will suffice, and learners can correct their errors just through receiv-

ing comments. In this regard, a majority of the earlier studies of error correction recommend pushing learners in their output rather than simply providing them with the correct form (Allwright, 1975, as cited in Tatawy, 2006; Hendrickson, 1978). The difference in the views of more and less experienced teachers is in giving comments by more experienced teachers. In this respect, the study is in line with the findings of Norouzian (2015). By reviewing teachers' views on open ended questions, there were no discrepancies between teachers' views on the questionnaire items and the open-ended questions. But in the learners' papers less experienced teachers did not provide any clue to help learners to correct themselves or did not determine the place of error occurrences, they only corrected learners' errors. Commentary was the popular item in more experienced teachers' beliefs (according to questionnaire), because they stated that giving comments suffices and correcting errors is not needed (according to their answers to open-ended questions); while, in reality (paper investigation), most of the more experienced teachers had given comments on learners' papers and also corrected their errors.

To determine what kind of error is considered the most useful one by the teachers to point out in students' writings is related to the third question. The results showed that less experienced teachers considered the vocabulary errors as the most useful errors to be pointed out in the learners' papers, while, more experienced teachers considered organization errors as the most useful errors to be pointed out. It can be explained if organization errors are pointed out, learners will be able to correct other errors themselves. Their answers to the open-ended questions corresponded to their beliefs on questionnaire items but in actual paper correction they corrected all errors, which put their beliefs under the question. In actual paper correction both groups corrected other kinds of errors, even punctuation and spelling errors which may not interfere with the expression of meaning so much. This finding is in line with the finding of Banan's (2003) study that indicated the reason for correcting all kinds of errors may be explained by theory of fossilization, that is, if they do not correct all the errors, they may be repeated in their forthcoming writings and would be internalized gradually. This view is evident in some of the answers to the open-ended questions.

The purpose of the forth research question was to know the less or more experienced teachers' actual practices regarding written corrective feedback. As it was pointed out above, less and more experienced teachers believe differently in marking learners errors but in actual paper correction the majority of less and more experienced teachers marked not only the errors that they had mentioned as important errors to be corrected but also corrected other errors that is in contrast with what they believed according to the questionnaire and open-ended questions. Moreover, some differences were observed in the most useful type of error correction between the more and less experienced teachers but in actual paper investigation no differences among them were noticed, in other words, both groups corrected almost all errors. This reflects inconsistencies between what they said or believed and what they actually did. This finding is in line with the findings of studies conducted by Lee (2003, 2009) in Hong

Kong which found that teachers' beliefs and their actual practices did not match, In the same vein, Icy (2003) reached the same results and found discrepancies between teachers' beliefs and their actual given feedback on learners' writings. Moreover, Rafiei and Salehi's (2016) study on the written feedback practices as well as the Iranian writing teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards written feedback in their writing classes revealed that although the most of them believe that teachers must give feedback to the language, organization and content of students' essays, most of the written feedback was given to the language. Therefore, a discrepancy was discovered between their perceptions and practices. However, the studies of Katia (2011) in Brazil and Akbari et al. (2008) in Iran showed no discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their actual written corrective feedback. As the results showed, there were differences between Iranian teachers' beliefs and their actual paper correction. Such mismatches between belief and practice might be under the influence of some contextual and sociocultural factors. In the educational settings in Iran, students want their errors to be corrected and if teachers do not correct learners' errors, they may be blamed by parents.

Conclusion

In this study, the less and more experienced teachers' beliefs in marking students' errors in writing; the most useful type of error correction feedback, the kind of error that is more useful to point out in students' writings, and their actual practices regarding written corrective feedback were investigated. This study was conducted due to the importance of teachers' beliefs on written corrective feedback, the influence of the beliefs on language acquisition (Pajares, 1992), and lack of studies related to teachers' beliefs and writing activities at university level. Based on the results, some differences in all four variables between less and more experienced and also some discrepancies in teachers' beliefs and their actual performance in correcting writing errors were observed. The results verified the findings of some studies on teachers' beliefs and written corrective feedback (Akbari et al, 2008; Icy, 2003; Katia, 2011; Rafiei & Salehi, 2016).

It can be said that because of discrepancy between what teachers believe and what they do, and lack of awareness about new writing activities among university teachers, in spite of all of the developments in the teaching of writing in different EFL contexts, the traditional approach, that is, product approach, is still used in teaching writing to learners in Iranian universities and colleges (Birjandi & Malmir, 2009). In addition, teachers' beliefs on written corrective feedback are important and its main function is to inform learners about their mistakes and help learners improve their writing by receiving advice and reaction (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Thus, it is essential for teachers to be aware of beliefs on corrective feedback and what they actually do in their classes.

The study has some implications for those who are involved in education including university policy makers and decision makers to provide conditions for

teachers to put their beliefs into practice. Teachers must also pay more attention to their own beliefs regarding written corrective feedback and explain their purpose of giving such feedbacks to the learners and their parents (if needed). Moreover, providing some gatherings and workshops for sharing teachers' opinions about correction and applying the best methods of written corrective feedback would be very helpful to teachers.

This study examined the beliefs of university ELT teachers regarding written corrective feedback based on their experience, further research can be conducted to compare male and female teachers' opinions in this regard. The participants of this study were university English teachers, future research can employ both teacher and student participants to find the matches and mismatches between their opinions concerning written corrective feedback. It would also be interesting to investigate the opinion of teachers for oral corrective feedback considering their teaching experience and gender.

References

Akbari, R., Kiani, G. R., Imani Naeeni, M., & Karimi Allvar, N. (2008). Teachers' teaching styles, sense of efficacy and reflectivity as correlates of students' achievement outcomes. *IJAL*, *11*(1), 1-27.

Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 95-127.

Azizian, E., & Rouhi, A. (2015). The effect of corrective feedback on the writing accuracy of feedback givers and receivers. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*(17), 21-41.

Banan, Q. (2003). *Teacher written feedback and students' writing: Focus and nature*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. http://research.ncl.ac.uk/

Bauersfeld, H. (1979). Research related to the learning process. *New Trends in Mathematics Teaching, 4*, 199-213.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education*. Pearson Education Inc.

Birjandi, P., & Malmir, A. (2009). The effect of task-based approach on the Iranian advanced EFL learners' narrative vs. expository writing. *Applied Linguistics Studies, 1*(2), 1-26.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 102-118.

Blázquez, F., & Tagle, T. (2010). Formación docente: Un estudio de las creencias de alumnos y profesoressobre el proceso de enseñanza y aprendizaje del inglés. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación, 54* (4), 1-12.

Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Journal, 55*(1), 21-29.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Language Teaching, 39*, 81-109.

Brown, D. (2003). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Pearson Education.

Brown, D. (2012). The written corrective feedback debate: Next steps for classroom teachers and practitioners. *TESOL Quarterly, 46,* 861-867.

Brown, D. (2014). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*, 1-23.

Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., & Ronning R. R. (1999). *Cognitive psychology and instruction* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall, Inc.

Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 1*(5), 1-17.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1,* 3-18.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36*, 353-371.

Erkmen, B. (2014). Novice EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning, and their classroom practices. *Journal of Education,* 29(1), 99-113.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38,* 47-65.

Fazio, L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on journal writing accuracy of minority-and majority-language students*. Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(4), 235-249.

Fernandez-Garcia, C-M., Maulana, R., Inda-Caro, M., Helms- Lorenz, M., & Garcia-Perez, O. (2019). Student perception of secondary education teaching effectiveness: General profile, the role of personal factors, and educational level. *Front. Psychol., 10*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00533

Ferris, D. R. (1995) Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 33-53. http://doi.org/10.2307/3587804.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., Brown, J., Liu, H., & Arnaudo Stine, M. E. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(2), 207-234.

Gobert, M. (2010). Grammar correction in ESL writing classrooms. In D. Anderson & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Cultivating real writers: Emerging theory and practice for adult Arab learners* (pp-121-133). HCT Press.

Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed*.), Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 23-46). Pergamon.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback*. Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112.

Heather, D., & Andrzejewski, A. (2009). *Teacher beliefs*. The Gale group. http://www.education.com/reference/article/teacher-beliefs/#D, (01-23-2012)

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*, 387-398.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

Icy, L. (2003)*.* L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8*, 216-237.

Katia, S. (2011). *Brazilian English as foreign language teachers' believes about grammar-based feedback on L2 writing.* ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Khader, F. R. (2012). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and actual classroom practices in social studies instruction. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 2*(1), 73-92.

Khanlarzadeh, M., & Nemati, M. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of EFL students: An improvement over previous unfocused designs. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(2), 55-68.

Khanlarzadeh, M., & Taheri, P. (2017). L2 writing teachers' perceptions and problems regarding written corrective feedback: Does holding a TEFL degree matter? *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 6*(1), 130-145.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implication.* Longman.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8*(3), 216-237.

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*, 285-312.

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal, 63*, 13-22

Lee, I. (2011). Feedback revolution: What gets in the way? *ELT Journal*, *65*, 1-12.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203-218. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition. Second language acquisition* (Vol.2, pp. 413-468). Academic Press.

Mike, G. (2008). *The effect of error codes on second language writing*. Pro-Quest Dissertations and Theses.

Moslemi, N., & Dastgoshadeh, A. (2017). The relationship between cognitive styles and young adult learners' preferences for written corrective feedback. *HOW Journal*, *24*(2), 11-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.19183/how.24.2.338.

Norouzian, R. (2015). Does teaching experience affect type, amount, and precision of the written corrective feedback? *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, *3*(5), 93-105.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.

Pakbaz, R. (2014). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing performance: Explicit vs. implicit. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2*(5), 12-17.

Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2012). EFL Teachers' beliefs toward using computer technology in English language teaching. *Journal of Studies in Education, 2*(2), 62-80. https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i2.1174

Poulson, L., Avramidis, E., Fox, R., Medwell, J., P., & Wray, D. (2001). The theoretical beliefs of effective teachers of literacy in primary schools: An exploratory study of orientations to reading and writing. *Research Papers in Education, 16*, 271-292.

Rafiei, M., & Salehi, N. (2016). Iranian English teachers' perception over applying different feedbacks in writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(2), 283-290.

Rahimi, M. (2009). The role of teacher's corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL learner's writing accuracy over time: Is learner's mother tongue relevant? *Reading and Writing, 22*(2), 219-243.

Rice, J. (2010). The Impact of teacher experience: Examining evidence and policy implications*. National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education research, Brief 11*. https://www.urban.org

Richardson, V. (2003). Pre-service teachers' beliefs. In J. Raths & A. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and teacher education: Advances in teacher education* (pp. 1-22). Information Age Publishers.

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*(2), 417–58.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 11*(2), 46-70. http://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v11i2.633.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 255-283.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System, 37*(4), 556-569.

Shelley, S., & Jill, M. (2010). Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. *Assessing Writing, 15*, 86-99.

Skott, J. (2009). Contextualizing the notion of belief enactment. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 12*(1), 27-46.

Taheri, M., Mashhadi Heidar, D. (2019). The effect of focused written corrective feedback on high/low self-regulated EFL learners' English writing ability. *Journal of Language and Translation, 9*(4), 93-103.

Talatifard, S. (2016). The effect of reactive focused corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching, 4*(3), 40-48.

Tatawy, M. (2006). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 2*(2), 1-19. http://tesolal.columbia.edu/article/corrective-feedback-in-sla/.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (2004). Dialogue: Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 337-343.

White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition*. Benjamins.

Yero, J. L. (2002). *Teaching in mind: How teacher thinking shapes education*. Mind-Flight Publishing.

Appendix
Teacher's Belief on Error Correction Feedback Questionnaire

Dear respondent,
The following questionnaire aims at exploring the university instructors' beliefs and practices in writing. Your responses will be of great value to the results of this survey and they will be treated as confidential. Your participation is highly appreciated.
Gender: Male _____   Female _____
Years of teaching experience: _____

Part one
If there are many errors in an intermediate to advanced EFL students' writing, out of the followings which do you think is most useful to do. Please check all that apply.

1. Mark all errors
2. Mark major errors but not minor ones
3. Mark most of the major errors but not necessarily all of them.
4. Mark only a few of the major errors
5. Mark only the errors that interfere with communicating your ideas
6. Mark no error and responds only to the ideas and content

Please explain the reasons for your choice(s), too.
I think number(s) is/are more useful way(s) because
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Part two
The following sentences all have the same error and a teacher has given a different type of feedback for each. For each sentence, circle the number that best describes the usefulness of the feedback for EFL students. For example, if you think feedback is a very good way to point out an error then circle number 5, if you think the feedback is a very bad way to point out an error then circle number 1.

1. Not useful at all   2. Not useful   3. Does not matter   4. Quite useful   5. Very useful

A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely (look at the sentence it is grammatically weak)
1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- **Clues or direction on how to fix an error** (the teacher leaves choices or clue conducive on how a student can correct his or her work)
Please explain your reasons for your choice.
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely   **1, 2, 3, 4, 5**
- **Error identification** (The teacher points out where the errors occurred but they are not corrected)
Please explain your reasons for your choice
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely (have been /wrong tense)   1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- C**orrection with the comments (**the teacher corrects the error and make comments)
Please explain the reasons for your choice
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely (have been)   **1, 2, 3, 4, 5**
- **Error correction (the teacher corrects error)**

Please explain the reasons for your choice

....

....

E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely   (wrong tense)   1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Commentary (the teacher gives feedback by making comments about error but not errors
are corrected)
Please explain the reasons for your choice

....

....

F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely   1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- No feedback on an error
Please explain the reasons for your choice

....

....

G. I am very lonely since I arrived in Victoria. (I'm sorry to hear that)   1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Personal comments on the contents (the teacher gives feedback by making comments on all the
ideas or content but they are not corrected)
 Please explain the reasons for your choice

....

....

Part three
For each of the following questions, circle the number that best describes its usefulness for EFL
students.

1. Not useful at all (useless)   2. Not useful   3. Does not matter   4. Quite useful   5. Very
useful

1. How useful is to point out the **organization errors** in an intermediate to advanced EFL learners
written work?   1   2   3   4   5
2. How useful is to point out the **content or idea errors** in an intermediate to advanced EFL learn-
ers written work?   1   2   3   4   5
3. How useful is to point out the **punctuation errors** in an intermediate to advanced EFL learners
written work?   1   2   3   4   5
4. How useful is to point out the **spelling errors** in an intermediate to advanced EFL learners writ-
ten work?   1   2   3   4   5
5. How useful is to point out the **vocabulary errors** in an intermediate to advanced EFL learners
written work?   1   2   3   4   5

Please explain the reasons for your choices

....

....

Thanks for your participation